

الصارم المسئول على من خالف الأصول  
رد على أمجد رفيق



Written by Abu Talha Musa Millington

الحمد لله رب العالمين و العاقبة للمتقين و لا عدوان إلا على الظالمين و أصلي و أسلم على عبده و رسوله محمد و على اله و صحبه و سلم. أما بعد.

It is not surprising to see that Brother Amjad Rafeeq, may Allah rectify him, has responded to my posts while at the same time not responding to the topic within the post. In addition to this he has sought to twist my words by bringing his two cents into what I clearly stated. Allah ta'ala has said:

“يأهل الكتاب لم تلبسون الحق بالباطل و تكتُمون الحق و أنتم تعلمون“

Oh people of the book why do you cover the truth with falsehood and why do you hide the truth and you know.

From that which is known from the manners of debate is that one must stay within the topic and clarify the point of contention which in Arabic is called *Bayaan Mawtin An Nizaa'* (بيان موطن (النزاع). And by having knowledge about the point of contention only then can a person can bring proofs and evidences regarding that which is being discussed. Hence, I begin this treatise, with Allah's support, with the first topic:

## Amjad Rafeeq's diversion from the point of contention:

He said:

I was sent something that was posted by Musa Millington on this matter and his speech focused around the usage of the term "shart" (condition).<sup>1</sup>

**The usage of the word *shart* (شرط) is not the issue of contention.** Rather the issue of contention is the use of the word "*shart*" unrestrictedly as a component of the definition of Imaan. <sup>2</sup>I never, in one paragraph or one word of my post discussed the issue of how the scholars used the word "*shart*" in specific instances.

Therefore, it is obvious that from the first line Amjad Rafeeq diverted others from the real topic, the definition of the Murji'ah Al Fuqaha regarding Imaan with the unrestricted use of the word "*shart*", and went into another topic which is the manner in which the scholars of the Sunnah use the word "*shart*" which I never myself denied. And I challenge him to bring one statement of mine where I denied the scholar's usage of the word "*shart*".

It is therefore very important to understand how the word "*shart*" is used by the Imams of Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah. This will display to us that the issue of contention is not the usage of the word itself but rather its use unrestrictedly in the definition of Imaan.

Shaikh Rabee' wrote:

Thirdly: The brother 'Abdul 'Azeez Faisal Ar Raajihii from the Riyaad newspaper said; I asked our Shaikh the Imam Ibn Baaz (رحمه الله) in the year 1415 ater the Hijrah, and we were in one of his classes about actions: Are they a condition of the correctness of Imaan or a condition for its completeness.

He said (رحمه الله) : From the actions there are those which are conditions for the correctness of Imaan and Imaan is not correct except by it like the prayer because the one who leaves it is a disbeliever. And from it there are (those actions) that are conditions for completeness where Imaan is correct without it with the fact that such a person would be a sinner when he leaves it off. <sup>3</sup>

الثالث : يقول الأخ عبد العزيز بن فيصل الراجحي في جريدة الرياض :

وقد سألت شيخنا الإمام ابن باز -رحمه الله- عام (1415هـ) - وكنا في أحد دروسه -رحمه الله- عن الأعمال : أهي شرط صحة للإيمان ، أم شرط كمال؟

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.salaftalk.com/threads/977-Ibn-Hajar-al-Asqalani-and-al-Eemaan-Response-to-a-Faajir-Kadhdhaab?p=1800#post1800>

<sup>2</sup> As occurred in the definition of Ibn Hajar.

<sup>3</sup> [http://rabee.net/show\\_book.aspx?pid=3&bid=260&gid=0](http://rabee.net/show_book.aspx?pid=3&bid=260&gid=0)

فقال -رحمه الله- : من الأعمال شرط صحة للإيمان، لا يصح الإيمان إلا بها كالصلاة ، فمن تركها فقد كفر. ومنها ما هو شرط كمال يصح الإيمان بدونها ، مع عصيان تاركها وإثمه.

As everyone is able to see, the usage of Ibn Baaz regarding the word “shart” was detailed and he demonstrated that his use of this word was to show that some actions take away a person’s Imaan completely and some actions would make him a sinner whereas he would not have left Imaan . However, this is entirely different to the manner in which Imam Ibn Hajar used the word “shart” when he said:

“So the Salaf say: Imaan is ‘Aqeedah in the heart, statements of the tongue, and actions of the limbs. They mean by this that actions are a condition (“shart”) for its completeness...”

Notice that Ibn Hajar generalized the used of “*shart*” and Shaikh Ibn Baaz specified and explained the usage of the word “shart”. Hence, the issue of contention was not as Amjad Rafeeq imagined or wished to imagine. For he said later on Salafitalk.com:

This again illustrates that Musa Millington does not grasp the issues here. **Since, the issue revolves around the word "shart" (condition) to Musa, then it makes no difference whether it is used for kamaal (perfection) or validity (sihhah)** and Musa's observation should be applied equally to the issue of sihhah (validity), and his judgement should apply to all those Shaykhs who make use of this word (shart) in that which relates to the sihhah (validity) of eemaan. Since the mere use of the word shart means that the actions (whether their abandonment invalidates eemaan [like the prayer] or merely decreases its obligatory perfection) are outside of eemaan. Upon this, this means that all those scholars (including Ibn al-Uthaymeen, al-Shibal, al-Barraak and those scholars who endorsed the book of al-Shibal, like al-Fawzan, Ibn Baz etc. and likewise Shaykh al-Albani) have either endorsed statements or employed statements that expel actions from eemaan thereby constituting the propagation of Irjaa' (according to Musa Millington).<sup>4</sup>

This reminds me of the statement of the Arabs where they say:

رمتني بداءها و أنسلت

She threw her disease at me then left.

It is obvious that this oppressive speech which was written by Amjad Rafeeq was not used to show the truth as truth and falsehood as falsehood. It was simply done in order to cover the mistakes that were written in the English translation of Usool Us Sunnah. This is definitely not how a Salafi conducts himself. Rather the Salafi discussed the issues at hand and if he is correct or wrong that which is most important is that the truth has been made highest. However, the

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.salafitalk.com/threads/977-Ibn-Hajar-al-Asqalani-and-al-Eemaan-Response-to-a-Faajir-Kadhdhaab?p=1800#post1800>

manner in which Brother Amjad debated this issue reminds me of the statement of the Messenger (صلى الله عليه وسلم) upon describing the attributes of hypocrisy:

“إِذَا خَاصَمَ فَجَرَ”

If he argues he becomes abusive.

And although the word (فجر) can mean abusive it can also mean that he diverts from the truth when he is arguing. In other words he was trying to refute my statements which focused on the topic of Ibn Hajar’s definition without delving into the topic itself.

In summary, all that Amjad Rafeeq put on Salafitalk.com has no bearing on the topic written by myself whatsoever since **the point of contention was not:**

The usage of the scholars of the word “*shart*”

But rather it was:

The usage of the word “*shart*” unrestrictedly in the definition of Imaan.

Furthermore, the refutation of what was written by Abu Fajr mentioned the usage of the words “shart kamal” and “shart sihhah” in its specific detailed sense and that refutation is on the triniMuslims.com website itself. It is impossible for me to have a problem with the usage of the word “shart” itself without looking at its usage and in which circumstances it was utilized. And anyone sensible would have seen that my focus was its usage unrestrictedly as its definition. I said on the triniMuslims website:

Now before anything else we have to make sure to not divert from the point of difference also called (موطن النزاع) in Arabic.

The issue is not who is defending Abu Fajr or who is defending Spubs rather the issue is far greater than that. It has to deal with the definition of Imaan and the issue of action being a part of Imaan rather than a condition for its completeness.

From what is obvious from the Spubs print of Usool Us Sunnah scanned by brother Amjad Rafeeq he used the speech of Ibn Hajar however it was not clarified. And this was in two junctures:

1. The meaning of Imaan in the language. **In this case saying that Imaan only means belief in the language was used by the Asharis as a means to demolish the creed of Ahlus Sunnah regarding Imaan. And Shaikh Ul Islam mentioned 16 angles as to why Imaan does not just mean belief in the heart.** (Al Imaan 101-108 Al Maktab Al Islaami)

2. **The definition of Imaan according to Ahlus Sunnah.** In this case although brother Amjad

Rafeeq clarified later on in the book that its definition is belief statements and actions and this it increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience **the fact remains that the definition put forward by Imam Ibn Hajar was not clarified to the common-folk reading the book.** And for that reason the book needs revision. And as far as I saw this was the intention of brother Abu Fajr.

However, the word propagate was not the best word to use regarding the book since this implies the meaning of him calling toward it day and night. However, the fact remains that there must be corrections to the book rather than calling Muslims names.<sup>5</sup>

Compare what I wrote as the issue of contention compared to what he wrote as the issue of contention:

I was sent something that was posted by Musa Millington on this matter and his speech focused around the usage of the term "shart" (condition). **It is clear to me that he has not grasped this matter well or the purpose and intent of the Scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah in using these phrases (shart al-kamaal, shart al-sihhah) and the true nature of the criticism against the speech of Ibn Hajar (and likewise against the Murji'at al-Fuquhaa).**<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://aa.trinimuslims.com/f47/a-clarification-on-the-book-foundations-of-the-10500/>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.salaftalk.com/threads/977-Ibn-Hajar-al-Asqalani-and-al-Eemaan-Response-to-a-Faajir-Kadhdhaab?p=1800#post1800>

## The usage of the words “*Shart Kamaal*” unrestrictedly.

For this issue I will leave the speech to two of our eminent scholars, Shaikh Saalih As Suhaimi, Shaikh Ibn Baaz and Shaikh Rabee’ Ibn Haadi Al Madkhali, and Shaikh Saalih Ibn Fawzaan Al Fawzaan:

Shaikh Saalih As Suhaimi said in his defense of Shaikh Naasir Ud Deen Al Albani:

“ The first angle: There is generality in our Shaikh Al Albani’s (speech) and he was preceeded. But we see that he was incorrect and it is his unrestricted statement that doing actions of Kufr do not take a person out of the religion. And this is incorrect from the Shaikh and goes against his own methodology when he practices it. It is an incorrect statement. **And also his (Shaikh Al Albani’s) statement that actions are a condition of completeness of Imaan with the fact that we see in his footnotes of Tahaweeyah and other than it that he affirms that actions are from Imaan.** And this is against the belief of the Murji’ah even the Murji’ah Al Fuqaha. **And we, even though we do not agree with him (رحمه الله) with this terminology “Actions are a condition for the completeness” because the one who leaves off actions totally and has never done any actions at all there is no doubt that there is consensus on his disbelief.** <sup>7</sup>

الوجه الأول : هناك إطلاق عند شيخنا الشيخ ناصر و هو مسبوق إليه ، لكن نرى أنه خطأ ، و هو إطلاقه بأن الكفر العملي - لا يخرج من الدين . و هذا خطأ من الشيخ يخالف منهجه هو نفسه عند التطبيق ؛ خطأ لفظي ، و أيضا قوله إن الأعمال شرط كمال في الإيمان ، بينما نراه في تعليقه على الطحاوية و غيرها يقرر أن العمل من الإيمان و هذا ضد مذهب المرجئة ، حتى مرجئة الفقهاء . و نحن و إن كنا لا نوافقه - رحمه الله - على مثل هذه العبارة : (أن العمل شرط كمال ) ، لأن من ترك العمل بالكلية و لم يعمل عملا مطلقا ، فلا شك في كفره إجماعا . و إن أدق عبارة ينبغي أن يقال هي عبارات السلف ؛ كما قال الإمام البخاري : ( أدركت ألفا من العلماء يقولون : الإيمان قول و عمل ) هذه أدق عبارة ، أما أن نمتحن الناس بكلمة : هل هو شرط صحة أو شرط كمال

Notice that which was underlined and notice that on this same basis, stating that the one who says that actions are a condition of completeness of Imaan has taken actions outside of Imaan, it was said about me the following:

. Since the mere use of the word shart means that the actions (whether their abandonment invalidates eemaan [like the prayer] or merely decreases its obligatory perfection) are outside of eemaan. Upon this, this means that all those scholars (including Ibn al-Uthaymeen, al-Shibal, al-Barraak and those scholars who endorsed the book of al-Shibal, like al-Fawzan, Ibn Baz etc. and likewise Shaykh al-Albani) have either endorsed statements or employed statements that expel actions from eemaan thereby constituting the propagation of Irjaa' (according to Musa Millington).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.ajurry.com/vb/showthread.php?t=12404> (Post #6)

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.salaftalk.com/threads/977-Ibn-Hajar-al-Asqalani-and-al-Eemaan-Response-to-a-Faajir-Kadhdhaab?p=1800#post1800>

Shaikh ‘Abdul ‘Azeez Ibn Baaz said regarding the speech of Ibn Hajar Al ‘Asqalani in his interview with Mishkaat Magazine:

**Al Mishkaat: Al Haafidh Ibn Hajar mentioned in Fath Ul Bari when he spoke about the issue of Imaan and actions , and whether or not it enters into its definition, and he mentioned that it is a condition of completeness. Al Haafidh said: “And the Mu’tazilah said: They are actions, speech and belief and the difference between them and the Salaf is that they made action a condition in its correctness and the Salaf made it a condition for its completeness.”**

Ibn Baaz responded:

**No, it is a part of Imaan, it is not a condition,** it is a part of Imaan. Imaan consists of statements, actions and beliefs, Imaan is made up of statements actions and beliefs according to Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama’ah.

**Al Mishkaat: There are those who say that it enters into Imaan but it is a condition of completeness?**

Ibn Baaz: No No, it is not a condition of completeness. It is a part, a part of Imaan. **This is the statement of the Murji’ah** who say that Imaan is statement and belief only. And some say it is acknowledging Allah’s existence and some say belief. All of this is wrong. The correct statement is that of Ahlus Sunnah that Imaan is statements, actions and belief, as in Waasiteeyah. It increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience.<sup>9</sup>

-المشكاة: ذكر الحافظ ابن حجر في الفتح عندما تكلم على مسألة الإيمان والعمل، وهل هو داخل في المسمى ، ذكر أنه شرط كمال ، قال الحافظ : (والمعتزلة قالوا : هو العمل والنطق والاعتقاد ، والفارق بينهم وبين السلف أنهم جعلوا الأعمال شرطاً في صحته والسلف جعلوها شرطاً في كماله).

فأجاب الشيخ : لا ، هو جزء ، ما هو بشرط ، هو جزء من الإيمان ، الإيمان قول وعمل وعقيدة أي تصديق ، والإيمان يتكون من القول والعمل والتصديق عند أهل السنة والجماعة.

-المشكاة : هناك من يقول بأنه داخل في الإيمان لكنه شرط كمال ؟

-الشيخ : لا ، لا ، ما هو بشرط كمال ، جزء ، جزء من الإيمان . هذا قول المرجئة، المرجئة يرون الإيمان قول وتصديق فقط ، والآخرون يقولون: المعرفة. وبعضهم يقول : التصديق . وكل هذا غلط. الصواب عند أهل السنة أن الإيمان قول وعمل وعقيدة، كما في الواسطية ، يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية".

Shaikh Rabee’ Ibn Haadi Al Madkhali wrote:

ويعلم الله أنني أول من حذر من هذا القول من قبل صدور كتاب خالد العنبري ونشره وأنني حذرت العنبري وطلبت منه حذفه " من كتابه، ولما جرى فيه الأخذ والرد كنت ممن يحذر من استخدامه أو الخوض فيه وأحض من يجادل فيه على التمسك بتعريف السلف للإيمان

<sup>9</sup> [http://rabee.net/show\\_book.aspx?pid=3&bid=260&gid=0](http://rabee.net/show_book.aspx?pid=3&bid=260&gid=0)



And Allah knows that I was the first one to warn against that statement before it came from the book of Khalid Al Anbari and it being spread. And I warned Khaalid Al Anbari and I asked him to take it away from his book. And when there was to and fro I was from the one who warned against its usage or arguing about it and I encouraged those who argued about it to hold onto the definition of the Salaf. <sup>10</sup>

He also wrote:

وقد حذرت قبل الناس ولا أزال أحذر - من القول بـ: أن العمل شرط في صحة الإيمان عند الخوارج، وشرط في كمال الإيمان عند أهل السنة

And I warned, before the people and I continue to warn against the statement of action being a condition of the correctness of Imaan as from the Khawarij and that it is a condition of the completeness of Imaan from Ahlus Sunnah. <sup>11</sup>

Shaikh Saalih Ibn Fawzaan Al Fawzaan was asked:

Question: There are those who say that: "Imaan is statements, belief and actions, but actions are a condition for the completeness of Imaan." And they also say: "There is no disbelief except by the heart." Is that statements from the statements of Ahlus Sunnah or not?

Answer: The one who says that did not understand Imaan or 'Aqeedah. And this is what we said in the answer to the previous question. That it is compulsory to learn 'Aqeedah from the people of knowledge and to take it from its correct sources and the answer to that question would be known.

His statement: Imaan is statement and action and belief... then he says: Action is a condition of the completeness of Imaan and in its correctness this is a contradiction!! How can action be from Imaan and then be a condition and it is known that a condition is outside what it is conditioned for. This is an contradiction from him. And he wants to bring together the statements of the Salaf and the statements of those who came after and he does not understand the contradiction because he does not know the statements of the Salaf and he does not know the reality of the statements of those who came after therefore he sought to join both. Therefore, Imaan consists of statements, actions and belief and actions are from Imaan and it is Imaan. And it is not a condition from the conditions of correctness of Imaan and it is not a condition for its completeness or other than it from the statements that are being spread nowadays. Therefore, Imaan consists of statements of the tongue, belief in the heart and actions of the limbs. It increases with obedience and decreases with disobedience. <sup>12</sup>

:

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

<sup>12</sup> <http://aloloom.net/vb/archive/index.php/t-6628.html>

هناك من يقول : " الإيمان قول واعتقاد وعمل، لكن العمل شرط كمال فيه " ، ويقول أيضاً : " لا كفر إلا باعتقاد " .. فهل هذا القول من أقوال أهل السنة أم لا؟

: الجواب

الذي يقول هذا ما فهم الإيمان ولا فهم العقيدة ، وهذا هو ما قلناه في إجابة السؤال الذي قبله : من الواجب عليه أن يدرس العقيدة على أهل العلم ويتلقاها من مصادرها الصحيحة، وسيعرف الجواب عن هذا السؤال وقوله : إن الإيمان قول وعمل واعتقاد .. ثم يقول : إن العمل شرط في كمال الإيمان وفي صحته، هذا تناقض !! كيف يكون العمل من الإيمان ثم يقول العمل شرط، ومعلوم أن الشرط يكون خارج المشروط، فهذا تناقض منه . وهذا يريد أن يجمع بين قول السلف وقول المتأخرين وهو لا يفهم التناقض، لأنه لا يعرف قول السلف ولا يعرف حقيقة قول المتأخرين ، فأراد أن يدمج بينهما .. فالإيمان قول وعمل واعتقاد ، والعمل هو من الإيمان وهو الإيمان، وليس هو شرطاً من شروط صحة الإيمان أو شرط كمال أو غير ذلك من هذه الأقوال التي يروجونها الآن . فالإيمان قول باللسان واعتقاد بالقلب وعمل بالجوارح وهو يزيد بالطاعة وينقص بالمعصية

This is exactly what I said on Trinimuslms.com:

Hence, by not clarifying the statement of Ibn Hajar, although he put the speech of Imam Al Baghawi afterward which clarifies the belief of the Salaf, a person could have been misled into 'Irjaa without doubt since the average reader may deduct that actions is from Imaan however it is a condition which is in fact an oxymoron i.e a statement where there are two opposites<sup>13</sup>

Amjad Rafeeq commented:

Here, al-Shibal himself has used the terms shart sihhah and shart kamaal, which according to Musa Millington would mean he has used an "oxymoron" (a usage that combines contradictory meanings), and that Shaykh Ibn Baz, Shaykh al-Fawzan and the other Shaykhs corroborated this (and have thus supported Irjaa!). It is clear that Musa does not understand the intent and purpose behind the usage of these terms.<sup>14</sup>

From this it is clear that Amjad Rafeeq needs to sit with the scholars and take knowledge from its pure sources beginning from the basics until he reaches higher in knowledge. As for reading large books and quoting them without understanding the Usool then this is improper.

Hence, it is clear from the speech of the ‘Ulama five things:

1. The one who says that actions are “shart kamal” in an unrestricted sense has fallen into one of the statements of the Murji’ah since he has taken actions out of Imaan.
2. That saying that actions are “shart kamal” and are from Imaan is an oxymoron or contradiction.
3. Warning of the scholars regarding the usage of this term.

<sup>13</sup> <http://aa.trinimuslms.com/f47/a-clarification-on-the-book-foundations-of-the-10500/>

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.salafitalk.com/threads/977-Ibn-Hajar-al-Asqalani-and-al-Eemaan-Response-to-a-Faajir-Kadhdhaab?p=1800#post1800>

4. Shaikh Ibn Baaz saw the statement of Ibn Hajar as a statement of 'Irjaa.
5. Additionally it shows that the following statement by Amjad Rafeeq, may Allah guide him, is completely incorrect:

**The terms shart al-kamaal and shart al-sihhah are terms that were originally used to help differentiate between the saying of the Mu'tazilah and the saying of the Salaf. Ibn Hajar appears the first to use it.**<sup>15</sup>

Allah ta'ala said:

"إن يتبعون إلا الظن و ما تهوي الأنفس"

They follow only conjecture and what their desires call them toward.

Hence, one wonders why is it that Amjad Rafeeq, may Allah guide him, wishes to imply that those who say that the usage of the words "shart kamal" in its unrestricted sense have said in fact that actions are outside of Imaan have fallen into the same dungeon as the people of Takfeer and the Hadaadis! My opinion, from what has been transpiring for the past few months, is that spubs and those with them are on a continuous campaign to ascribe those in Dammaj and close to the Mashayikh in Dammaj to Hadadeeyah since they have not stopped refuting Shaikh Yahya Al Haajori and accusing him of 'Aqeedah errors.<sup>16</sup>

## Conclusion

Upon ending this treatise which was written quickly we would like to advise Amjad Rafeeq and his co-horts with the following:

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.salafitalk.com/threads/977-Ibn-Hajar-al-Asqalani-and-al-Eemaan-Response-to-a-Faajir-Kadhdhaab?p=1800#post1800>

<sup>16</sup> <http://aa.trinimuslims.com/f4/salafi-publications-9532/>

1. Seek knowledge with the scholars. Do not just ascribe to them and stay in Birmingham. Rather it is upon the brothers who did not take from the lips of the scholars such as Abu Khadeejah and Amjad Rafeeq to travel and study these issues in its entirety so they would not make such atrocious assumptions and mistakes as seen on Salafitalk.com.
2. Books are not the main source of knowledge. They are meant to gain benefit from but however in books there are things that are unrestricted, and that which is restricted etc. As the scholars have said:

"من كان كتابه شيخه فخطأه أكثر من صوابه"

Whoever his book is his scholar then his errors would be more than where he is correct.

3. Have jealousy for the Salafi Da'wah not yourselves. And accept your errors when they have been clarified even if you have hatred for the person who is correcting you. Allah has said:

"و لا يجرمكم شنآن قوم على أن لا تعدلوا اعدلوا هو أقرب للتقوى"

And do not let your hate of a people cause you not to be just. Be just this is closer to piety.

و صلى الله على نبينا محمد و على اله و صحبه و سلم

كتبه موسى ميلنغتون الترنيدادي

Date: 11<sup>th</sup> March 2012